

Toward a post-identity philosophy: along a flight line with Gilles Deleuze?[✉]

Cécile Voisset-Veysseyre*

A Thousand Plateaus (1980) has been the beginning of a beautiful thinking on becoming; Deleuze and Guattari created the concept of deterritorialization which corresponds to Melville's "outlandish" and announces a turning-point in philosophical modern practice as it appears in *What is Philosophy?* (1991) where the ancient – Greek – logic is criticized in regard to such a practice. In France, the change of logic was already at stake with Jacques Lacan in *The Seminar* (1956-1957)¹ and with Jacques Derrida in *The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond* (1980)²; in *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (1985), Gilles Deleuze claimed the invention of "a new logic."³ Taken in context, the notion of becoming challenges the traditional logic with the subject and its attributes as well as its correlated object; the logical notion of identity is questionable.

In his translator's foreword to *A Thousand Plateaus*, Brian Massumi insists on the Deleuzian and Guattarian opposition to a "rocklike

* An abridged version of this paper was read during the 4th International Deleuze Studies Conference (Copenhagen, 27-29 June 2011: *Creation, Crisis, Critique*).

* Cécile Voisset-Veysseyre ([cecile.voisset-veysseyre@orange.fr](mailto:cécile.voisset-veysseyre@orange.fr)) has a diploma in philosophy; she is a research fellow at the Université Paris XII (labo LIS).

¹ Jacques Lacan, *Le Séminaire, IV: la relation d'objet (1956-1957)*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1994, Point XXII, p. 386, opposed our usual logic [*notre logique coutumière*] to an elastic logic [*une logique en caoutchouc*].

² Jacques Derrida, *La Carte postale de Socrate à Freud et au-delà*, Paris: Éditions Aubier-Flammarion, coll. "La philosophie en effet," 1980, p. 277, declared: "J'avais alors avancé la proposition d'une autre logique."

³ Gilles Deleuze, *Cinéma 2. L'image-temps*, Paris: Éditions Minitext, coll. "Critique," 1985, p. 359: "C'est une nouvelle logique qu'il faut inventer."

identity"⁴ which sounds like a Cartesian one, given *Metaphysical Meditations* search for a rock on which to lean and to make appear a subject – "ego cogito" – as an uncritical data or as a firm certitude because of God's existence; the commentator went on: "Nomad thought' does not immure itself in the edifice of an ordered interiority; it moves freely in an element of exteriority. It does not repose on identity; it rides difference."⁵ Actually, such an opposition is clearly directed against identity and/or the One – the One of identity: "The One that becomes two."⁶ In ignoring the "Binary logic,"⁷ the pop philosophy which talks about all of us without exceptions or discriminations deals with multiplicity instead of the "unity or identity"⁸ and supposes to go "beyond the One-Two."⁹ Many logics seem then to be possible, instead of a two valued logic: "There is no universal propositional logic."¹⁰ Deleuze and Guattari refused the language as an idol; in the way paving by Foucault, they affirmed: "Regimes of signs are not based on language."¹¹ Despite the reign of signification a psychoanalytical discourse perpetuated, they intended to convince people of another "regime of signs or semiotic"¹² in proposing a "pragmatics (or schizoanalysis)."¹³ The

⁴ Brian Massumi, "Translator's Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy," in *A Thousand Plateaus*, London & New York, Continuum, 1988, p. ix-xii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

⁶ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5-6 ("The binary logic of dichotomy").

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31. At the same page, we read "unity and identity."

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18. Follows a reject of the duality one-multiple (p. 23): "It is not the One that becomes Two or even directly three, four, five, etc."

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

¹¹ *Ibid.* This idea (p. 155) is relevant to *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [1969] by Foucault with its theory of enunciations, see again *A Thousand Plateaus*: "Regimes of signs are thus defined by variables that are internal to enunciation but remain external to the constants of language and irreducible to linguistic categories." (note 39 of the page 585)

¹² Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

point is to free ourselves from a destiny situation: “It is a question of destroying a dominant atmospheric semiotic.”¹⁴

In *What is Philosophy?*, logic is denounced as out of date for “its infantile idea of philosophy”¹⁵; philosophy gives the way of thinking by concepts (a Kantian definition) and from now as an art of creating concepts which are not at all propositions: “Logic is reductionist not accidentally but essentially and necessarily [...], it wants to turn the concept into a function.”¹⁶ For Deleuze, the scene of battlefield would have been no more the metaphysical one; so, he dismissed the “new logic” of the analytic and/or positive theory (Vienne Circle and its logical empiricism) according to a logico-semantic tradition. Unexpectedly, the utopian way was indicated; it was because we deal with a text talking about reason and desire, with a revolutionary text which produces a disorder in our way of thinking; but in what sense this kind of writing is concerned with the “rivalry”¹⁷ between logic and philosophy? How can philosophy be reborn on the ruins of an ancient one which has been territorialized? In short, how to do with “That’s logic”¹⁸ of Alice?

Regarding to the norm of Gender as irrelevant to the Deleuzian and Guattarian purpose, the first moment of the reading has to get rid of an American and queer reception of a text where “transversal” is synonymous with “transgendered” and whose inscription in an

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

¹⁵ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, p. 22. In chapter one of *Essays Critical and Clinical*, Deleuze criticizes “an infantile idea of literature” [*une conception infantile de la littérature*] (*Critique et clinique*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1993, p. 12).

¹⁶ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, *op. cit.*, p. 135. We can compare the Deleuzo-Guattarian definition of philosophy with this one: “Schizoanalysis is like the art of the new.” (*A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 225.)

¹⁷ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

¹⁸ Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1908, p. 51.

European tradition explains “the transatlantic disconnection”¹⁹ of its study; Brian Massumi alluded to this aspect: “GENDER-BIASED USAGE has been largely eliminated through pluralization or the use of male and female pronouns. However, where Deleuze and Guattari seem deliberately to be using ‘man’ to designate a socially constructed, patriarchal standard of human behavior applied to both men and women, the masculine generic has been retained.”²⁰ The second moment of this reading compares *A Thousand Plateaus* with *What is Philosophy?*, taking a look on fictional but related texts to a philosophical discourse in order to think what Paul Patton calls “a logic of multiplicities.”²¹ In a third and conclusive time, it will be shown that a post-identity philosophy depends on a reflection on what does it mean to write, referring to this demand: What about “models of nomadic and rhizomatic writing”²²?

Beyond the mirror

In the Deleuzo-Guattarian text, gender is territory: mark, signature. *A Thousand Plateaus* makes no difference between gender and sex, according to the *socius* of any society from which the subject is territorialized as a preformed or fix – well-constructed or defined – identity: “Sex with their own ghetto territorialities.”²³ Gender belongs to code as a hierarchical category or as a classifying tool by which we can indeed imagine “real transexualities.”²⁴ But even in the

¹⁹ Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses. Towards a Materialist Theory Becoming*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002, p. 32.

²⁰ Brian Massumi, “Translator’s Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy”, *loc. cit.*, p. xix.

²¹ Paul Patton, “Introduction” to *Deleuze: A Critical Reader*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., p. 2.

²² Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 26. For “the nomad thought,” see p. 418.

²³ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *op. cit.*, p. 117. Sexuality is submitted to territory (p. 359). On mark and territory, see p. 348; on territorializing and signature, see p. 347. One remembers us: “The signature, the proper name, is not the constituted mark of a subject, but the constituting mark of a domain, an abode.” (p. 349)

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

margins of the code, “deterritorialization (transcoding)”²⁵ is only differentiation and reterritorialization. Regarding especially to the birth of instituted philosophy in the City, gender is the value for the male friends and rivals who are subjected to the identity injunction of a school; more generally, people “are segmented, not in such a way as to disturb or disperse, but on the contrary to ensure and control the identity of each agency, including personal identity.”²⁶ Unity delineates the territory of a State encoding of flow by law and empowering of desire in the guise of its alienation in repression: “State apparatuses of identity.”²⁷ Because there is no identity without fabric of subjection [*assujettissement*] or without law – “the legislator and the subject”²⁸ – and because law is the structure by which psychoanalysis “lays claim to the role of *Cogitatio universalis* as the thought of the Law”²⁹ at the same time it is signifying the subject, schizoanalysis liquefies all identity and explodes strata. Out of “the regime of subjectification”³⁰ or subjection and against the stratification of desire flow within a site of individuation, each of us has then to semiotize oneself: “Learning to undo things, and to undo oneself, is proper to the war machine: the ‘not-doing’ of the warrior, the undoing of the subject.”³¹ No more self (*ego*) with its secrets (*depth*) could be a motto of thinking, at least a way of experimentation: “Where psychoanalysis says, ‘Stop, find your self again,’ we should say instead, ‘Let’s go further still, [...], we haven’t

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 194. We read: “Territorialization is precisely such a factor that lodges on the margins of the code of a single species and gives the separate representatives of that species the possibility of differentiating. It is because there is a disjunction between the territory and the code that the territory can indirectly induce new species. Wherever territoriality appears, it establishes an intraspecific *critical distance* between members of the same species; it is by virtue of its own disjunction in relation to *specific differences* that it becomes an oblique, indirect means of differentiation.” (p. 355)

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 414.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 415.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 141. On “subjection” or “subjectification,” see p. 143.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 442. At stake is “the distribution of the two sexes.”(p. 339)

sufficiently dismantled our self.”³² The image of subject (unity, identity, sameness *versus* otherness) is broken: “The self is only a threshold, a door, a becoming between two multiplicities.”³³ Escaping is then proliferating, following a line instead of identifying or obeying; for we are not only made by segments: “Individual or group, we are traversed by lines...”³⁴ Among different sorts of lines – “bastard line,” “orphan line of thinkers” (Massumi, p. ix-x) – and so on, there are lines of flight or of deterritorialization: “That is what multiplicity is.”³⁵

Multiplicity – becoming: “Becoming and multiplicity are the same thing”³⁶ – takes place in a non predictable universe; a subject cannot be attributed (subjugated) under the one, the object disappears with it: “A multiplicity has neither subject nor object,”³⁷ no beginning nor end. “The multiple *must be made*”³⁸ means then that we must go “beyond any opposition between the one and the multiple,”³⁹ engages in a line by a go-between or a passing-through. Becoming and gender appear but opposite in regard to a schizoanalysis which is the theory of an opening subjectivity while psychoanalysis is the theory of “a linear proceeding of subjectivity,”⁴⁰ of a determinate one. Psychoanalytical theory views desire as lack and identity as the mark of this lack in the name of Phallus, desire as conservative and not as revolutionary; on the contrary of the linguistic and psychoanalytic model, schizoanalytical philosophy theorizes the sense as creation, as becoming; we can imagine like this: “On the road to the asignifying and asubjective.”⁴¹ On the line as on a surface, we move beyond the signification and its segments.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 167.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 223. We read: “For we are made of lines.” (p. 215)

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

Deleuze refused with Guattari the dogma of signification, which is not sense: “There is no significance independent of dominant signification, nor is there subjectification independent of an established order of subjection.”⁴² That’s why semiotics is also a pragmatics, a constructed space for variation of relations: “Pragmatics is a politics of language.”⁴³ That supposes a change of view point, an extra-territorialization: keeping a place from the outside, not staying in a territory from one uses to talk, to act and so on.

Identity is operative at a molar but not a molecular level, not at a “micrological level”⁴⁴; given “everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously a *macropolitics* and a *micropolitics*”⁴⁵, the identity rock – the rock identity – which is named “sedimentary rock”⁴⁶ is really the touchstone of a system which ignores a non-linguistic sign-theory. In their study of linguistic postulates, Deleuze and Guattari view in masculine and feminine “a power marker”⁴⁷ we call today ‘the gender mark’; but gender is first all a category belonging to a grammatical register one which transmits orders: to be so *or* not – *or else* – to be so. Against such an exclusive disjunction, the multiplicity paradigm means: to be so *and* to be so (never mind). The new logic is a logic of lines (intensities), a transformational map according to the rational generative linguistics of Hjelmslev, the Danish theoretician who belonged to the Circle of Copenhagen and who constructed a new linguistic, who considered the sense as a form to be done by some texts of an unknown future. Against the “imperialism of language,”⁴⁸ one has to erase “*territorial signs*”⁴⁹ and to practice “the deterritorialized sign”⁵⁰; the philosopher of *Logic of*

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 91. We have to read simultaneously “a pragmatics internal to language” (p. 104) and “a language within a language.” (p. 108)

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

Sense disagreed with the idea of “a preformed logical order,”⁵¹ he was a non-Aristotelian philosopher who states that thinking logically is now thinking topologically.

What about a non-A logic or a Utopian way?

Maybe a logical song – in *The logical song* a fool sings in crying “but please tell me who I am” – has been heard by the two authors of *A Thousand Plateaus*. A new thinking order has to be made: “Not following a logical order, but following alogical consistencies or compatibilities.”⁵² On its own plane, the thought travels along flight lines and surfs waves of deterritorialization; it disputes altogether the principles of identity ($A \equiv A$), of “(non)contradiction”⁵³ ($A \neq \bar{A}$) and of the excluded third (A is either A or \bar{A} , no third possibility). Against the antic logic which learns to exclude, the new logic knows the “*included middle*”⁵⁴; the disjunction is not an exclusive but inclusive one in another regime of signs. (A)logical or (a)grammatical, it is the same: “Forming grammatically correct sentences is for the normal individual the prerequisite for any

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 275.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 276. As we know, “meaning [...] embraces both the logical and the illogical.” (Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze and Guattari*, London and New York: Routledge, 1989, p. 71) Alogical is then the only escape because it constitutes a flight line to deterritorialize the sense as signification, to save it from a dominant regime of signs.

⁵³ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 294: “The same goes for the principle of contradiction: this plane could also be called the plane of noncontradiction. The plane of consistency could be called the plane of nonconsistency. It is a geometrical plane, no longer tied to a mental design but to an abstract design. Its number of dimensions continually increases as what happens happens, but even so it loses nothing of its planitude. It is thus a plane of proliferation, peopling, contagion.” It is against a predicative logic that Deleuze and Guattari built their system of thought; in *Chaosmose*, Félix Guattari declares: “On ne pose donc pas la qualité ou l’attribut comme second par rapport à l’être ou la substance; on ne part pas d’un être comme pur contenant vide (et a priori) de toutes les modalités possibles d’existant.” (Paris: Éditions Galilée, 1992, pp. 151-152)

⁵⁴ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 516.

submission to social laws. No one is supposed to be ignorant of grammaticality; those who belong in special institutions. The unity of language is fundamentally political. There is no mother tongue, only a power takeover by a dominant language that at times advances along a broad front, and at times swoops down on diverse centers simultaneously.⁵⁵ So, lines of flight disenclose – deterritorialize – the sense as a linear one. Ending with “the phallus-tree”⁵⁶ or the arborescent model, Deleuze and Guattari declare: “A new rhizome may form in the heart of a tree, the hollow of a root, the crook of a branch.”⁵⁷ An intertextual reading of *A Thousand Plateaus* remembers us *Alice’s adventures in Wonderland* – “one of the trees had a door leading right into it”⁵⁸ – where a new playful logic is exemplified by the author of a *Symbolic logic*, a handbook with syllogisms.

The mutual exclusion of outside and inside is ignored by a utopian way. Concerning a war machine, *A Thousand Plateaus* evokes something “from elsewhere”⁵⁹; *What is Philosophy?* alludes to a political solution as a provisional model for liberating of binomic – one-two – logic: “Actually, *utopia is what links philosophy* with its own epoch, with European capitalism, but also already with the Greek city. In each case it is with utopia that philosophy becomes political and takes the criticism of its own time to its highest point. Utopia does not split off from infinite movement: etymologically it stands for absolute deterritorialization but always at the critical point at which it is connected with the present relative milieu, and especially with the forces stifled by this milieu. *Erewhon*, the word used by Samuel Butler, refers not only to no-where but also to now-here.”⁶⁰ It is time now for a non-academic philosophy (out of canons

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁵⁸ Lewis Carroll, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, p. 96.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 388.

⁶⁰ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100. Samuel Butler is praised for having written a philosophical text, what his preface confirms: “They told me he [the reader] reported that it was a

or criteria of thinking) to practice conceptualization in order to do not separate humanity from itself and from nature (men, women, children, and so on). Such a creative philosophy wages war against transcendent values in order to avoid disaster of “the *logical possibility as philosophical impossibility*”⁶¹ which is relevant to a logic of predicates as well as a logic of propositions. A literature of escape is thus a help.

Should we not understand the case of schizophrenia or psychosis as a case of “illogism”?⁶² It is interesting to compare the Erewhonian utopia with another fiction, a science-fiction one, which is entitled

philosophical work, little likely to be popular with a large circle of readers.” (*Erewhon or over the range*, p. x) Let’s add that the narrator of this utopia – a dystopia where repression opposes for example the judge to the child, to the fool – is a Spinozist philosopher (“My chief consolation lies in the fact that truth bears its own impress,” p. 16), a man who proposes a theory of machines (“The more highly organized machines are creatures,” p. 212) and who doesn’t believe in temper or in interiority (“Whether, strictly speaking, we should not ask what kind of levers a man is made of rather than what is his temperament?” p. 215).

Éric Alliez underlined that such an encounter between philosophy and utopia is not a blueprint (“On pourra dire que la philosophie devient politique dans cette conjonction utopique du concept avec l’actualité,” *La signature du monde ou Qu’est-ce que la philosophie de Deleuze et de Guattari?*, p. 41); he did mention the author of *Life and Habit* instead of *Erewhon* (p. 70, note 8), referring to a dialogue of Lucian (*Icaromenippus*, 21-22) which talks about a reordering of relationships against a disorder and about a substituting of a new order to another ancient one. Logic is of course relevant of our political life and of our desires; questioning it supposes first destroying it.

⁶¹ Éric Alliez, *La signature du monde*, *op. cit.*, p. 10: “La possibilité logique comme impossibilité philosophique.”

⁶² Samuel Butler, *Erewhon*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1940, p. 129: “When the offence is over and done with, it is condoned by the common want of logic; for this merciful provision of nature, this buffer against collisions, this friction which upsets our calculations but without which existence would be intolerable, this crowning glory of human invention whereby we can be blind and see at the same moment, this blessed inconsistency, exists here as elsewhere”.

*The World of Ā*⁶³; this extraordinary book of Alfred Elton van Vogt imagine the world of unborn and deals with the negation that Deleuze hated. Here, the old logic is clearly a deadly one; this dreadful world is a mirror of life or a reversal image of birth. In this story, the non-identity is concerned by the non-Aristotelian beings the hero encounters while he tries to fly from Earth with its war – its gangs – to Venus. Beginning with a quotation of Russell, this book shows that the logic of Aristotle is a cause of suicide in a big City where stands an Institute of Semantics; the philosophy of null-A questions the social failure of a rational creature who should have emotions in one and unique universe, as if another logic (a logic of love in another world) could provoke a rebellion against society⁶⁴. Here, the postface distinction between “map” and “territory” refreshes the study of *A Thousand Plateaus*: “The rhizome is [...] a map and not a tracing. [...] The map is open and connectable in all of its dimensions.”⁶⁵ Tracing is alike to a close representative space, not to an open expansive totality. If Deleuze and Guattari talked about a “guerilla logic”⁶⁶ or about a “guerilla warfare”⁶⁷ and chose a war vocabulary in their texts (*Negotiations*, for example), it is because contingency is always a reorder of sense and because “chess is a semiology.”⁶⁸ On that point, the influence of Lewis Carroll appears again: “‘The question is,’ said Alice, ‘whether you *can* make words mean different things’ / ‘The question is,’ said Humpty Dumpty, ‘which is to be master – that’s all.’”⁶⁹ New regimes of signs suppose necessarily a nomadic logic: “If the nomad can be called the Deterritorialized par excellence, it is precisely because there is no reterritorialization *afterward* as with the migrant.”⁷⁰ The patchwork

⁶³ Also named *The World of Null-A*, published in 1948.

⁶⁴ In *The World of Ā* where he defends a many-valued logic, A. E. Van Vogt refuses war – neither black nor white – by the non-Aristotelian figure; his postface alludes to San Francisco contestation by rebellious students.

⁶⁵ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 459. We read also “minority warfare.” (p. 466)

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 389.

⁶⁹ Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking-Glass*, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁷⁰ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

model of the text – text as texture (cloth) and as process – shows that flight lines are the making of undecidable propositions and the producing of events. Sense is direction, it is found in any direction (in all routes).

In regard to a Stoic classification of learning which divides philosophy in three parts (firstly with logic, secondly with physics, and thirdly with morals), *What is Philosophy?* could prepare to a reconciliation between philosophy and logic; art – cinema (the free indirect discourse according Pasolini’s *Heretical Experience*), literature (the cut according to Robbe-Grillet’s *Nouveau Roman*, but also the “new logic” according to Maurice Blanchot’s *Friendship*) and so on – could too realize such a conjunction by a sort of language within a language. After having confronted himself with philosophical history, Deleuze extra-territorializes his thought by a reflection on utopia which is not only a philosophical and political but also a literary text. A philosophy which is not enslaved by logic has to conceptualize “*a line that delimits nothing, that describes no contour*”⁷¹ according to a text in which “desubjectified”⁷² is synonymous with “externalized” and by which “feelings become uprooted from the interiority of a ‘subject.’”⁷³

What about (a new) writing?

A philosophy of lines insists in the Deleuzian text which rewrites the Lacanian idea of line according to *The Seminar* (1957-1958), “the significant line” (*la ligne signifiante*) for “the line of desire” (*la ligne de désir*); it refuses linguistic by which identities are included in a long chain of significance according to the master – Great – signifier and by which differences and genders make sense. Writing is not speaking; language is not tongue. “Speaking in tongues”⁷⁴ is not philosophizing, nor deterritorializing; it cannot share anything except translating from a verbal language into another one, it separates. Writing has nothing to do with the usual practice of

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 549.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 393.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 392.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

language which repeats some difference “fundamentally between those who do not speak the same tongue.”⁷⁵ Writing is inventing. It means geometrizing, drawing lines; the line of writing – of flight – consists in emerging from a plane and in existing on it, deriving along it in the same it creates it: “The shared line of flight of the weapon and the tool: a pure possibility, a mutation.”⁷⁶ Thus: “Writing is becoming.”⁷⁷

“To write is perhaps to bring this assemblage of the unconscious to the light of day, to select the whispering voices, to gather the tribes and secret idioms from which I extract something I call my Self (*Moi*). I is an order-word.”⁷⁸ But to write is to procure passwords. To write equals to enunciate, to draw a viewpoint by which gender is mapping as a point or a knot according to a weaving model of text. Deleuze and Guattari posit that “politics works language from within”⁷⁹ and that “politics precedes being.”⁸⁰ A theory of becoming is then a political one which uses language as a site of transformation and which produces sense. Here is the Deleuzian and Guattarian definition of language as rhizome: “Language is a map, not a tracing.”⁸¹ Writing is a style affair; it is challenging all assignments or predictions, because style is escaping by flight lines; writing is moving, here is the grand affair of the great style.

To write is not (no more) to write like..., writing is not mimicry contemplating the model-copy of the Platonic theory. Music is indeed the model for writing and line of writing, to be *on line* expresses the musical register from which a thinking of writing is possible; about music as a satisfied paradigm for a great deterritorialization, we read this: “Being a man *or* a woman no longer exists in music.”⁸² A line of becoming – “a pure moving line”⁸³

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 475.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 445.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 335.

– is then not produced by points; such a line is then the opposite of the point: “It passes *between* points, it comes up through the middle.”⁸⁴ In the Deleuzian text, thinking makes appear some *incognita terra*; becoming is “a no-man’s-land.”⁸⁵ “Writing has nothing to do with signifying. It has to do with surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come”⁸⁶ because a “map has multiple entryways.”⁸⁷ No doubt that writing regards the map-tracing [*agencement*] which liberates subjectivity and desire in decentering and in coming to surface.

Deleuze was preoccupied by “a writing system.”⁸⁸ We already noticed the suspicious reaction from the philosopher of Vincennes to the claim of the French writer and theoretician Monique Wittig (1931-2003) who proposed a non-gender writing instead of a feminine – gendering – writing; for Gilles Deleuze declared to Claire Parnet: “Crying ‘hurrah for multiple’ is not doing it, we have to make it; and saying ‘down with genders’ (‘no more gender’) is unsatisfied, we must actually write out gender or as if gender wouldn’t be.”⁸⁹ We cannot help to believe that the *Straight Mind* (the title of the Wittigian essays on writing and politics) is not correlated with the Deleuzian refuse of a straight line as he repeated in *Essays Critical*

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 323. We read that “Becoming is the movement by which the line frees itself from the point, and renders points indiscernible.” (*ibid.*, p. 324)

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 323.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 548.

⁸⁹ Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues*, Paris: Éditions Flammarion, 1977, p. 23: “De même, crier ‘vive le multiple,’ ce n’est pas encore le faire, il faut faire le multiple. Et il ne suffit pas non plus de dire ‘à bas les genres,’ il faut écrire effectivement de telle façon qu’il n’y ait plus de ‘genres,’ etc.)” About the French dispute concerning a Lacanian heritage at a revolutionary or crucial moment and about Wittig’s “Paradigm” (1979) which was published in the same review where Guattari talked about liberation, see Cécile Voisset-Veysseyre, “L’amazonien en questions: Monique Wittig ou Gilles Deleuze?,” *Trahir*, december 2010 (the French version of a paper read for the *Third International Deleuze Studies Conference*, “The Amazonian in questions: Monique Wittig or Gilles Deleuze?,” Amsterdam, 13 July 2010.

and *Clinical*: “Il n’y a pas de ligne droite, ni dans les choses ni dans le langage.”⁹⁰ Deleuze was clearly in search for “a new line [...], a kind of *line of flight*.”⁹¹ The liberation of flows on all flight lines is surely a literature affair which demands to criticize logic and its political concepts: “I am drawing lines, lines of writing, and life passes between the lines.”⁹²

*

**

What sort of problem is then identity if not a logic one? As a category, identity contradicts the living movement of virtual lines: “Life must answer the answer of death, not by fleeing, but by making flight act and create.”⁹³ To go beyond identity – mirror, image and representative language – supposes an “an axis of escape [*fuite*], at a vanishing point [*point de fuite*], along a diagonal”⁹⁴ in the diagrammatic picture which includes possibilities of sense. Of course one can follow line and flirt with borderline, danger exists; yet, the post-identity problematic is concerned by a becoming text where lines are not words (points) but sentences and by which language is no more an enemy language with its own insights. In the Deleuzian text, the sense is not the meaning and (a)grammatical is not synonymous with meaningful. Sense is way and there is neither right nor wrong way, because the common way is not the only way. In regard to a Nietzschean inheritance (*The Will to Power* states that identity and subject are but illusions, that logic is lying for there is only becoming and multiplicity), this new text has to redefine being by becoming in order to save living by exhausting it as intensity: “Lines of flight, for their part, never consist in running away from the

⁹⁰ Gilles Deleuze, *Critique et clinique*, op. cit., p. 12.

⁹¹ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, op. cit., p. 218. At the same page, we read that “the line of flight is like a train in motion.” The page 208 talks about “a whole line of writing.”

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 222.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

world but rather in causing runoffs, as when you drill a hole in a pipe; there is no social system that does not leak from all directions, even if it makes its segments increasingly rigid in order to seal the lines of flight.”⁹⁵ If “the causal line, or the line of flight” is a “creative line,”⁹⁶ then we have to draw our own line. Thus, writing is writing oneself without destiny; it has no particular destination. Let us quote this beautiful declaration: “I am now no more than a line. I have become capable of loving, not with an abstract, universal love, but a love I shall choose, and that shall choose me, blindly, my double, just as selfless as I.”⁹⁷ Writing is going away, it is going forward, it is advancing, outsidings, deterritorializing.

Sense is becoming. The aim of the Deleuzian and Guattarian project was certainly a dismissal of identity as instrumental political concretion. A redefinition of the philosophical exercise deals with the logical game as a space for becoming. If Philosophy sings the great and universal deterritorialization of Terra since its departure from its native land (Greece with its schools), this song remains for all of us a solitary refrain.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

Bibliography

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus*, Translation and Foreword by Brian Massumi ("Translator's Foreword: Pleasures of Philosophy"), London & New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari, Felix (1994). *What is Philosophy*, Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia University Press, European Perspectives.

*
**

Alliez, Éric (1993). *La signature du monde ou Qu'est-ce que la philosophie de Deleuze et Guattari?*, Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Bogue, Ronald (1989). *Deleuze and Guattari*, Routledge: London & New York.

Braidotti, Rosi (2002). *Metamorphoses. Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Butler, Samuel (1940). *Erewhon or over the range*, The Nelson Classics, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Carroll, Lewis (1908). *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Carroll, Lewis (1908). *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Deleuze, Gilles (1985). *Cinéma 2. L'image-temps*, Paris: Éditions Minuit, coll. "Critique."

Derrida, Jacques (1980). *La Carte postale de Socrate à Freud et au-delà*, Paris: Éditions Aubier-Flammarion, coll. "La philosophie en effet."

Foucault, Michel (2002). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [1969], trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London and New York: Routledge.

Guattari, Félix (1992). *Chaosmose*, coll. "L'espace critique," Paris: Éditions Galilée.

Lacan, Jacques (1994). *Le Séminaire, IV: la relation d'objet (1956-1957)*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Patton, Paul (1996). *Deleuze: A Critical Reader*, Introduced and Edited by P. Patton, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Van Vogt, Alfred Elton (1948). *The World of Null-A*, Street & Smith.